

## REMARKS

Claims 6-19 and 23 are presently pending. Claims 6-19 stand rejected. Claim 23 is added. Claims 1-5, and 20-22 are cancelled without prejudice.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated from Steudel. Claim 6 recites, among other limitations, “shortening a blanking period in the data to accommodate auxiliary data, without dropping any of the video frames”.

The Office Action indicates that Steudel teaches “shortening a blanking period in the data to accommodate auxiliary data without dropping any of the video frames (fig. 1b, col. 1, lines 6-16 & col. 2, lines 31-32, shortening the back porch, which is part of the horizontal blanking period”.

Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection, because Assignee disagrees the statement that figure 1b, col. 1, lines 6-16 and col. 2, lines 31-32 teach “shortening the back porch”. Rather, the back porch is actually lengthened (see col. 2, line 32 “to lengthen the duration of the back porch”). Moreover, Assignee respectfully submits that in Figure 1a, b, c, the distance between the dotted lines remains the same, accordingly, Steudel does not teach “shortening a blanking period”. Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection to claim 6 and dependent claims 7-19.

Regarding claims 7 and 8, which appear to be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Steudel, although the Office Action makes reference to Hobbs. It is believed that Examiner cited Hobbs by oversight and intended to cite Steudel. If this is not correct, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection because all of the limitations are not described in one reference.

Claim 23 is amended to recite, among other limitations, “shortening a vertical blanking period in the data to accommodate auxiliary data without dropping any of the video frames, wherein the communication link comprises a single link”. It is noted that Martin uses a third wire pair is used to provide the start

blanking period and end blanking period signals which are used by the first and second wire pairs. Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection to claim 23.

## **CONCLUSION**

For at least the foregoing reasons, each of the pending claims are allowable, thereby placing the application in a condition for allowance. Examiner is requested to pass this case to issuance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the amount enclosed or any additional fees which may be required under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 13-0017 in the name of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,



---

Mirut Dalal  
Attorney for Assignee  
Reg. No. 44,052

Date: June 23, 2009

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.  
500 W. Madison – 34<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, IL 60661

Phone: (312) 775-8000  
FAX: (312) 775-8100